

Annual Education Report

2008-2009

Woods Lake Elementary: A Magnet Center for the Arts

3215 Oakland Dr.

Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Phone Number 269.337.0790 . Fax Number 269.337.1637



Woods Lake Elementary: A Magnet Center for the Arts --where academics and the arts create opportunities for learning.

Superintendent: Dr. Michael F. Rice

Principal: Mr. William M. Hawkins

2008-09 Board of Education

President: Ms. Patti Sholler-Barber

Vice-President: Ms. Mollie Peterson

Secretary: Ms. Liz Henderson

Treasurer: Mr. Eric Breisach

Trustee: Mr. Phillip W. Dietrich

Trustee: Ms. Marcy L. Peake

Trustee: Ms. Carol McGlenn



Kalamazoo Public Schools

Every child, every opportunity, every time!

Overview of School

Accreditation Status & Education YES! Grades

The chart below identifies our buildings accreditation status and grades as determined by Education YES!

Education Yes! Report Card	2008 – 2009		2007 – 2008	
	Score	Grade	Score	Grade
Mathematics	75.7	C	71.3	C
English Language Arts	61	D	62.2	D
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Social Studies	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Achievement Subtotal	68.4	D	66.8	D
Indicators of School Performance	100	A	100	A
Preliminary	79	C	78	C
AYP Status	Met AYP- Y		Met AYP- Y	
Composite Grade	C		C	
Michigan Accreditation Status *	Accredited		Accredited	

* Schools continue to be accredited unless they receive a D Alert grade, at which point they become designated as unaccredited for the state of Michigan

Specialized School

The school focuses on using visual, performing, technological, and literary arts to increase academic achievement.

2008–2009 Highlights

- Reading First successfully implemented year four
- --Tutors worked with classroom teachers during the day, providing instructional support with math and reading
- --Multiple interventions were used and documented for children at the strategic and intensive levels as indicated by DIBELS and Benchmark assessments
- A year long Principal's Institute was put in place by The Michigan Department of Education. 14 staff members, a Process Mentor Team from MDE and KRESA , and a Leadership Coach took part and helped to monitor progress and helped the building begin to implement a professional learning community model.
- Continuation of Positive Behavior Supports was established and specific procedures and routines were modeled and practiced throughout the year. SWIS data was routinely reported to the School Improvement Team and staff in creating behavior plans for targeted students.
- Two Title I Academic Facilitators worked with identified students on academic achievement and desired school appropriate behaviors.
- A Title I Academic Coach helped to facilitate grade level meetings, work with students, coordinate assessment schedule and implementation of assessments, and run the Book Nook.
- A Reading First facilitator helped to facilitate grade level meetings, coach and train teachers, provide instructional resources, and collect and interpret ELA achievement data.

2008–2009 Highlights (cont.)

- Core content was reinforced through arts integration activities, which included the Gilmore Keyboard lab that provides group piano lessons for 150 students, 3rd grade workshops with the Wellspring Dance Company members, and the Kalamazoo Symphony Orchestra partnership for all students K-5.
- A KPS Innovation Grant was awarded to Woods Lake to support the development of the "Publishing Center" – an area where students and staff can publish written materials in the library.
- A Title I School Improvement Grant was awarded and provided staff with training and support using the Professional Learning Community model of collaboration, formative common assessment, and achievement data analysis.
- Two bilingual staff members worked with more than 60 students in the Bilingual Center and were translators at Parent/Teacher Conferences and for school newsletters.
- Both a Literacy and Math night were targeted for all students they were held in the fall and winter, each included a meal, stations to see teachers and literacy coaches working with children, tubs of books, math manipulatives, and materials for parents to take home and work with their child, and door prizes. Translators were also provided to assist with Spanish speaking parents.
- Made AYP.

Parent-Teacher Conference Attendance Rates

School	Fall 2008		Spring 2009	
	#	%	#	%
Woods Lake	474	86	514	95

Parent Involvement

Parent Involvement Policy

District Policy

The District will consistently work, in a variety of ways, to strengthen meaningful family participation in the education of their children.

Woods Lake Parent Involvement

Parents are encouraged to participate in the Parents Association, the school improvement team and other school enrichment activities. Parent involvement is assessed through the yearly parent survey.

Highly Qualified Staff

- 100% of the staff is teaching in their credential area of experience.
- No teachers with emergency or provision credentials are teaching in either the high or low poverty schools.
- No teachers are teaching in the classroom in either the high or low poverty schools that are not highly qualified.
- 1 Administrator with a Masters
- 34 teachers; 16 with a Bachelors Degree; 13 with a Masters Degree; and 5 with a Masters+30
- All Title I instructional paraprofessionals are compliant with the NCLB requirements for highly qualified.

School Improvement Plan

Reading	
Goal:	All third grade special education students will improve proficiency in Reading by meeting or exceeding state targets.
Data to support goal selection:	The MEAP English Language Arts (Reading) scores of third grade special education students are 39 points below the building score and 37 points below the state target.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Entire staff will continue to receive training in both the MDE model, focused on the instructional core and the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities. The structure to continue the process will be put in place to guarantee collaborative lesson design, common assessment, and data analysis. Benchmark assessment training has given teachers a tool to diagnose and detect reading deficiencies and prescribe interventions and strategies to improve reading proficiency. Grade level curriculum guides will be used to assist teachers and provide resources for the delivery of instruction,
Accomplishments:	<p>Grade 3 MEAP Reading 9 of 11 subgroups demonstrated a positive gain in MEAP reading scores, most notably a 12% gain in the male subgroup</p> <p>Grade 4 MEAP Reading 9 of 10 subgroups demonstrated a positive gain in MEAP reading scores, most notably a 23% increase in the white subgroup</p> <p>Grade 5 MEAP Reading 9 of 10 subgroups demonstrated a positive gain in MEAP reading scores, most notably a 25% increase in the Hispanic subgroup</p> <p>Grade 6 MEAP Reading ELL subgroup performed 15% above district subgroup</p> <p>Grades 1, 2, 3, 4 ITBS Increase in scores demonstrate growth from 05-06 to 06-07 in vocabulary and comprehension</p>
Implications for next year:	We will continue to monitor our progress in Grade Level Meetings, by using common formative assessments, summative assessments, data analysis, job embedded professional development, ongoing conversation and horizontal and vertical collaboration. We will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this process through the School Improvement Planning Team.
Writing	
Goal:	All economically disadvantaged students will meet or exceed state achievement English Language Arts Writing targets.
Data to support goal selection:	The MEAP writing scores of economically disadvantaged students in Grade 3 are 19 points below the scores of the district and 38 points below the state target. The MEAP writing scores of economically disadvantaged students in Grade 5 are 9 points below the scores of the district and 26 points below the state target.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Entire staff will continue to receive training in both the MDE model, focused on the instructional core and the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities. The structure to continue the process will be put in place to guarantee collaborative lesson design, common assessment, and data analysis.
Accomplishments:	In 3 rd grade writing eight out of twelve sub-groups demonstrated improvement for the 2008-2009 school year. 18% of the 3 rd grade scored proficient in writing. 25% of the children identified as special education students scored at the proficient level. 3 rd grade African American students scored 30% proficient.
Implications for	We will continue to monitor our progress in Grade Level Meetings, by using common formative assessments, summative
Math	
Goal:	All fifth and sixth grade economically disadvantaged students will meet or exceed state math targets.
Data to support goal selection:	The MEAP math scores of fifth grade economically disadvantaged students were 16 points below the state target of 62%
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Entire staff will continue to receive training in both the MDE model, focused on the instructional core and the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities. The structure to continue the process will be put in place to guarantee collaborative lesson design, common assessment, and data analysis. Implementation of the new math curriculum and all of its resources.
Accomplishments:	<p>Grade 3 MEAP Math 9 of 10 subgroups demonstrated a positive gain in MEAP math scores, most notably a 21% gain in the African American subgroup</p> <p>Grade 4 MEAP Math 5 of 10 subgroups demonstrated a positive gain in MEAP math scores, most notably a 13% gain in white subgroup and a 23% gain in non-economically disadvantaged subgroup</p> <p>Grade 5 MEAP Math All subgroups demonstrated a positive gain (except female which maintained the same score) in MEAP math scores, most notably a 44 % gain in male subgroup</p> <p>Grade 6 MEAP Math 9 of 10 subgroups had higher scores than the district subgroups, notably the Hispanic subgroup (23% higher)</p> <p>Grade 3 ITBS Economically Disadvantaged students in grade 3 increased 15% and surpassed district scores</p>
Implications for next year:	We will continue to monitor our progress in Grade Level Meetings, by using common formative assessments, summative assessments, data analysis, job embedded professional development, ongoing conversation and horizontal and vertical collaboration. We will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this process through the School Improvement Planning Team.

School Improvement Plan

Science	
Goal:	All fifth grade students will be proficient in science (MEAP).
Data to support goal selection:	The fifth grade MEAP Science score for all students was one point below the district score. The fifth grade EdPerformance Grade Level Equivalency score was one year, three months below grade level.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Entire staff will continue to receive training in both the MDE model, focused on the instructional core and the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities. The structure to continue the process will be put in place to guarantee collaborative lesson design, common assessment, and data analysis. The hands-on activities from the Battle Creek Science curriculum has made science more interactive and continues to assist our students in comprehending the GLCE's.
Accomplishments:	The 4 th grade Science GLE score increased from a 3.9 to a 4.0. The 6 th grade Science GLE score increased from a 5.4 to a 5.7.
Implications for next year:	We will continue to monitor our progress in Grade Level Meetings, by using common formative assessments, summative assessments, data analysis, job embedded professional development, ongoing conversation and horizontal and vertical collaboration.
Social Studies	
Goal:	All students will be proficient in social studies (MEAP).
Data to support goal selection:	The sixth grade MEAP Social Studies score for economically disadvantaged students was eight points below the students not qualifying as economically disadvantaged.
Planned Strategies and Interventions:	Entire staff will continue to receive training in both the MDE model, focused on the instructional core and the DuFour model of Professional Learning Communities. The structure to continue the process will be put in place to guarantee collaborative lesson design, common assessment, and data analysis.
Accomplishments:	The Woods Lake MEAP social studies score increased by seven points from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009 for all students. African American students and Hispanic students improved their scores by 19 points each.
Implications for next year:	We will continue to monitor our progress in Grade Level Meetings, by using common formative assessments, summative assessments, data analysis, job embedded professional development, ongoing conversation and horizontal and vertical collaboration.



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

School Assessment Data

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: READING/ LANGUAGE ARTS (ELA)

Student Group 3rd Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	62	68	81	98	6	56	26	11
	2008-09	70	73	83	98	4	66	25	5
African American	2007-08	58	58	67	100	0	58	37	5
	2008-09	70	65	69	100	3	67	27	3
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		64	79					
	2008-09		82	80					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		89	90					
	2008-09		83	92					
Hispanic	2007-08	74	60	71	100	4	70	13	13
	2008-09	69	62	74	94	0	69	25	6
White	2007-08	54	80	85	92	13	42	25	21
	2008-09	67	85	87	96	4	63	26	7
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	23	36	53	100	0	23	62	15
	2008-09	58	47	55	50	0	58	33	8
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	78	61	63	100	9	70	9	13
	2008-09	76	60	69	100	6	71	18	6
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	59	60	71	100	3	57	28	12
	2008-09	69	65	74	99	1	67	26	6
Migrant	2007-08			64					
	2008-09			64					
Male	2007-08	53	64	78	96	2	51	33	14
	2008-09	65	72	81	97	3	62	32	3
Female	2007-08	70	71	84	100	9	61	20	9
	2008-09	74	74	86	98	5	69	19	7

Student Group 4th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	55	56	76	86	8	47	35	9
	2008-09	54	57	77	99	1	53	40	6
African American	2007-08	50	43	56	95	11	39	36	14
	2008-09	56	43	56	100	0	56	38	5
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		61	74					
	2008-09		46	73					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		80	86					
	2008-09		100	88					
Hispanic	2007-08	58	51	64	92	0	58	33	8
	2008-09	47	48	64	95	0	47	53	0
White	2007-08	62	73	82	72	10	52	33	5
	2008-09	56	76	83	100	4	52	32	12
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		30	43					
	2008-09	8	22	44	38	0	8	77	15
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	54	45	49	87	0	54	38	8
	2008-09	44	51	50	100	0	44	56	0
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	51	45	63	86	8	43	38	11
	2008-09	50	46	64	99	0	50	44	6
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			51					
Male	2007-08	42	54	73	82	0	42	42	16
	2008-09	41	54	74	100	3	38	51	8
Female	2007-08	65	59	80	90	14	51	30	5
	2008-09	65	61	79	98	0	65	30	4

Student Group 5th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	56	64	78	91	13	44	28	16
	2008-09	54	59	78	96	7	47	38	7
African American	2007-08	49	49	58	93	5	44	31	21
	2008-09	43	46	58	100	8	35	48	10
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	73					
	2008-09		73	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		75	86					
	2008-09		94	89					
Hispanic	2007-08	78	61	63	95	11	67	11	11
	2008-09	50	60	66	92	0	50	50	0
White	2007-08	55	81	84	92	27	27	32	14
	2008-09	68	75	84	93	12	56	24	8
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		23	42					
	2008-09		25	42					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	60	54	44	88	7	53	20	20
	2008-09	62	58	50	100	0	62	38	0
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	54	53	65	89	6	48	31	15
	2008-09	48	49	66	97	4	43	45	7
Migrant	2007-08			45					
	2008-09			54					
Male	2007-08	54	59	75	93	15	38	26	21
	2008-09	43	56	76	95	5	38	43	14
Female	2007-08	59	68	81	89	10	49	29	12
	2008-09	64	62	81	98	9	55	34	2

Student Group 6th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	54	62	80	83	6	48	44	2
	2008-09	61	67	80	96	6	54	35	4
African American	2007-08	47	49	59	88	0	47	53	0
	2008-09	49	54	61	100	2	46	46	5
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		73	78					
	2008-09		70	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		85	89					
	2008-09		92	89					
Hispanic	2007-08	58	58	69	90	5	53	42	0
	2008-09	71	63	68	94	6	65	29	
White	2007-08	64	76	86	58	27	36	27	9
	2008-09	74	83	85	95	16	58	21	5
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		27	41					
	2008-09		21	45	100			82	18
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	53	46	53	94	6	47	47	0
	2008-09	64	69	50	100	7	57	36	0
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	53	51	67	85	2	51	46	2
	2008-09	59	58	68	99	3	57	38	3
Migrant	2007-08			63					
	2008-09			58					
Male	2007-08	41	56	76	83	3	38	55	3
	2008-09	54	65	77	98	5	49	41	5
Female	2007-08	65	68	83	83	9	56	35	0
	2008-09	68	70	82	95	8	60	30	3

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: MATHEMATICS

Student Group 3rd Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	75	76	90	98	28	47	25	0
	2008-09	78	81	91	98	37	42	22	0
African American	2007-08	76	67	76	100	26	50	24	0
	2008-09	64	74	79	100	21	42	36	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		91	90					
	2008-09		82	92					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		100	97					
	2008-09		91	96					
Hispanic	2007-08	74	72	85	100	13	61	26	0
	2008-09	75	74	87	94	38	38	25	0
White	2007-08	71	87	94	92	38	33	29	0
	2008-09	96	92	95	96	52	44	4	0
Students with Disabilities	2007-08	38	52	77	100	0	38	62	0
	2008-09	75	71	55	50	17	58	25	0
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	74	73	83	100	13	61	26	0
	2008-09	76	72	85	100	41	35	24	0
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	73	69	84	100	23	50	27	0
	2008-09	77	76	86	99	34	43	23	0
Migrant	2007-08			85					
	2008-09			80					
Male	2007-08	67	78	90	96	21	47	33	0
	2008-09	86	84	92	97	41	46	14	0
Female	2007-08	82	75	90	100	34	48	18	0
	2008-09	71	79	91	98	33	38	29	0

Student Group 4th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	60	66	86	87	17	43	28	12
	2008-09	60	69	88	100	21	40	37	2
African American	2007-08	53	53	69	95	14	39	33	14
	2008-09	56	57	74	100	15	41	44	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		67	85					
	2008-09		62	87					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		81	95					
	2008-09		100	95					
Hispanic	2007-08	50	56	79	92	17	33	25	25
	2008-09	55	67	81	100	10	45	40	5
White	2007-08	76	84	91	72	24	52	19	5
	2008-09	72	84	92	100	36	36	24	4
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		49	65					
	2008-09	38	47	68	100	0	38	62	0
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	57	55	74	93	14	43	21	21
	2008-09	53	64	76	100	11	42	42	5
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	58	55	77	88	14	44	28	14
	2008-09	56	59	80	100	18	38	41	3
Migrant	2007-08			81					
	2008-09			82					
Male	2007-08	61	67	86	82	16	45	23	16
	2008-09	58	70	88	100	25	33	40	3
Female	2007-08	59	64	86	92	18	41	32	9
	2008-09	63	68	88	98	17	46	35	2

Student Group 5th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	49	59	74	93	17	32	38	13
	2008-09	54	54	77	98	21	33	34	12
African American	2007-08	33	42	51	93	8	26	41	26
	2008-09	48	41	55	100	15	33	38	15
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	68					
	2008-09		47	72					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		62	90					
	2008-09		88	92					
Hispanic	2007-08	63	57	62	100	21	42	32	5
	2008-09	42	41	66	92	17	25	50	8
White	2007-08	68	78	81	92	32	36	32	0
	2008-09	65	75	83	96	23	42	23	12
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		33	44					
	2008-09		30	47					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	47	48	54	100	12	35	47	6
	2008-09	50	42	61	100	29	21	43	7
Economically Disadvan- tagged	2007-08	46	48	60	93	13	33	40	14
	2008-09	54	45	64	99	19	35	32	13
Migrant	2007-08			58					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	65	61	75	95	15	50	23	13
	2008-09	55	57	78	97	21	34	32	13
Female	2007-08	33	58	73	91	19	14	52	14
	2008-09	52	51	76	98	20	32	36	11

Student Group 6th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	51	55	73	83	21	30	32	17
	2008-09	61	68	80	98	26	35	33	6
African American	2007-08	42	39	48	91	10	32	39	19
	2008-09	46	53	61	100	17	29	49	5
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		73	69					
	2008-09		80	77					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		85	90					
	2008-09		92	93					
Hispanic	2007-08	58	58	61	90	21	37	21	21
	2008-09	78	74	71	100	33	44	11	11
White	2007-08	50	73	80	53	40	10	40	10
	2008-09	74	83	85	95	37	37	21	5
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		28	35					
	2008-09	18	31	45	100	9	9	73	9
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	53	49	51	94	18	35	24	24
	2008-09	73	72	62	100	20	53	13	13
Economically Disadvan- tagged	2007-08	49	42	58	85	19	30	35	16
	2008-09	59	59	69	100	24	34	36	6
Migrant	2007-08			57					
	2008-09			73					
Male	2007-08	50	58	72	80	21	29	32	18
	2008-09	59	67	79	98	26	33	28	13
Female	2007-08	51	53	73	85	20	31	31	17
	2008-09	63	69	81	98	27	37	37	0

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: Science

Student Group 5th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	62	62	82	93	9	54	20	18
	2008-09	57	58	83	98	13	44	24	18
African American	2007-08	54	46	59	93	5	49	18	28
	2008-09	50	42	62	100	13	38	18	33
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		54	81					
	2008-09		67	84					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		77	89					
	2008-09		88	91					
Hispanic	2007-08	74	60	69	100	5	68	16	11
	2008-09	58	52	73	92	0	58	33	8
White	2007-08	73	80	89	100	18	55	18	9
	2008-09	65	79	89	96	19	46	31	4
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		50	62					
	2008-09		47	64					
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	53	51	53	100	6	47	29	18
	2008-09	50	48	59	100	0	50	43	7
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	59	51	70	93	4	54	21	20
	2008-09	54	48	72	99	12	43	24	22
Migrant	2007-08			56					
	2008-09			63					
Male	2007-08	70	62	82	95	10	60	13	18
	2008-09	50	59	83	97	13	37	32	18
Female	2007-08	55	63	82	91	7	48	26	19
	2008-09	64	56	83	98	14	50	18	18

Michigan Educational Assessment Program – MEAP: Social Studies

Student Group 6th Grade	School Year	School % of Students Proficient & Advanced	District % of Students Proficient & Advanced	State % of Students Proficient & Advanced	% Tested in School	% of Students in School at Each Achievement Level			
						Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic
All Students	2007-08	36	48	73	84	8	28	22	42
	2008-09	43	50	74	96	13	30	34	23
African American	2007-08	20	31	45	88	3	17	17	63
	2008-09	39	32	48	100	12	27	29	32
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2007-08		64	71					
	2008-09		50	71					
Asian/Pacific Islander	2007-08		75	84					
	2008-09		69	84					
Hispanic	2007-08	40	35	59	95	0	40	25	35
	2008-09	59	42	59	94	12	47	24	18
White	2007-08	55	69	81	58	18	36	36	9
	2008-09	42	74	81	95	16	26	47	11
Students with Disabilities	2007-08		35	40					
	2008-09	55	31	40	100	18	36	27	18
Limited English Proficient	2007-08	33	23	40	100	0	33	28	39
	2008-09	43	38	41	100	7	36	36	21
Economically Disadvan- taged	2007-08	33	33	56	87	5	28	22	45
	2008-09	42	39	59	99	10	32	35	23
Migrant	2007-08			48					
	2008-09			48					
Male	2007-08	47	49	72	86	10	37	10	43
	2008-09	41	52	74	98	15	26	31	28
Female	2007-08	26	46	73	83	6	21	32	41
	2008-09	45	49	73	95	10	35	38	18

School Assessment Data

Local and Norm Referenced Achievement Data

At Woods Lake: A Magnet Center for the Arts we administer a variety of assessments to help determine student needs and progress. Students in grades 1 through 4 take the Iowa Test of Basic Skills to determine how students are progressing compared to a national peer group. Students in grades 3-9 also take Performance Series. Performance Series is a computer based assessment that gives teachers instant feedback on how well students are performing compared to their national peers and on the Michigan GLCE's.

Nationally Normed Achievement Tests – Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

ITBS				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	07-08	08-09	07-08	08-09
First Grade				
African American	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.3
Hispanic	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.4
White	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.6
Economically Disadvantaged	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.4
Special Education	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.2
Second Grade				
African American	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.3
Hispanic	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.3
White	3.4	3.6	2.9	2.9
Economically Disadvantaged	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.4
Special Education	2.6	2.1	2.3	2.2
Third Grade				
African American	3.3	3.1	3.2	3
Hispanic	3	3.1	3	3.2
White	3.6	3.9	3.3	3.6
Economically Disadvantaged	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.3
Special Education	2.6	3.3	2.5	3.1
Fourth Grade				
African American	4.1	4.3	3.9	4
Hispanic	4.1	4.2	3.8	3.8
White	4.9	5.1	4.4	4.5
Economically Disadvantaged	4.1	4.3	3.9	4

Nationally Normed Achievement Tests – Performance Series

EdPerformance				
Sub-group	Reading GLE		Math GLE	
	07-08	08-09	07-08	08-09
Fifth Grade				
African American	2416	2542	2283	2326
Hispanic	2550	2539	2411	2321
White	2639	2645	2445	2434
Economically Disadvantaged	2472	2546	2340	2354



Every child, every opportunity, every time!

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Achievement Targets in Relation to AYP Targets and Attendance Rate

	Reading/Language Arts						Mathematics						Additional Academic Indicator		
	Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Percent Tested			% Proficient & Advanced			Attendance Rate		
Student Group Elementary School	Goal: 95%			Goal: %			Goal: 95%			Goal: %			Goal: 90%		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
All Students	100	99	97	80	82		100	100	97	88	88		94	92	
African American	101	99	96	75	77		101	99	97	89	83		94	91	
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	N/A	N/A	96	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	97	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	99	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	100	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
Hispanic	100	102	96	80	79		103	103	98	87	87		95	93	
White	98	99	97	85	89		98	100	97	88	94		94	94	
Students with Disabilities	100	99		55	57		100	100		78	77		92	90	
Limited English Proficient	98	99		82	79		103	101		85	85		95	93	
Economically Disadvantaged	100	101		78	77		100	102		88	85		94	91	



Core Curriculum

The purpose of the Kalamazoo Public Schools curriculum is to ensure that all students learn the same essential content based on the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) standards and expectations. The curriculum ensures that students will be able to access, evaluate, and use information in a technology-dependent world. The curriculum provides optimal learning opportunities for all students and is designed to ensure post-secondary success in institutions of higher education and the workplace.

The Process of Curriculum Development and Alignment

As of 2007-2008, curriculum leaders, in conjunction with teachers, have integrated three major approaches to curriculum work in the development model. This model recognizes that creating curriculum guides alone does not enhance student achievement; it is merely the first step. Curriculum work must funnel down to classroom instruction, assessment, and instructional improvement based on data in order to maximize student achievement. As such, the model is focused on the work of Ainsworth, Marzano, Wiggins, and Tomlinson specifically as related to using standards for curriculum development, unit design, lesson design, instruction, differentiated instruction, and assessment (formative and summative). Our current process is indicated below:

- Unpack and prioritize Michigan Department of Education's grade level content standards (i.e., GLCEs and HSCEs).
- Unpack expectations using Ainsworth model of identifying verbs, nouns, concepts, skills, big ideas, essential questions, identify level of Bloom's Taxonomy for each expectation, create assessment items aligned to each prioritized standard
- Prioritize expectations
- Group expectations to create measurement topics
- Create end of course assessments
- Create assessment map
- Chunk
- Create course map and common formative assessments*
- Train team in data analysis
- Create units of instruction using the Understanding by Design (UbD) model
- Implement, assess, reflect, modify for improvement

*Common formative assessments are defined as periodic or interim assessments, collaboratively designed by grade-level or course teams of teachers and administered to all students in a grade level or course several times during the quarter, semester, trimester, or entire school year (Ainsworth, 2006).

The process of revising curriculum guides in the district involves teachers and curriculum leaders collaboratively conducting gap analyses using the following approach, in part, outlined by MDE:

- Standards and expectations published by MDE are identified and prioritized.
- Teams review existing documents to 1) determine whether GLCEs or HSCEs are taught in the curriculum and 2) identify the level of proficiency outcomes should be met.
- Pacing guides are reviewed to determine alignment along with corresponding resources.

Guides requiring revisions adhere to the cycle noted under *Process for Curriculum Development*.

All curriculum guides in the district are based on state standards and expectations. Serving as *living documents*, curriculum guides are reviewed annually to ensure alignment to state expectations and to incorporate needed revisions based on student data, research on best practices, and feedback from all stakeholders. In an effort to increase student achievement and effectively implement the curriculum, teachers across content areas engage in ongoing professional development. The sessions are designed to assist teachers in developing their capacity to a) further study and develop strategies to implement the GLCEs and HSCEs, b) use data to drive instruction, and c) identify areas of interest to strengthen classroom instruction. The district offers a variety of professional growth opportunities: differentiated professional development that allows teachers to develop in areas of interest; grade level/department sessions; school and district-wide sessions based on curriculum, data, and school improvement plans; training for group facilitators and content leaders representing their respective buildings; and voluntary after school sessions to further support instruction.

Several data warehousing systems are accessed to plan and evaluate professional development (building and district level), evaluate the impact of curriculum and instruction on student achievement, and support the development of school improvement plans. At the building level, staff members further align classroom instruction based on results from item analyses, disaggregated data based on subgroups, and noted trends over a period of time. At the district level, both aggregate and disaggregated data are used to establish academic goals, identify programming needs, and plan meaningful and relevant professional development.

The Foundation of Core Courses

All core courses (English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) are based on GLCEs or HSCEs. Students have access to courses across levels with opportunities for differentiated instruction. Resources are aligned to curriculum guides based on state expectations and offer activities to meet diverse learning styles and needs. Classes plan for small and whole group differentiated instruction to ensure that all students have equal and equitable access to appropriate core outcomes. Student data (formative and context-bound) is also used to guide decision making and select appropriate resources. Special education teachers receive core curriculum guides and participate in training to interpret expectations for areas under study. Special education teachers also have the opportunity to work with building teams in identifying best practices for reaching struggling learners. Professional development opportunities with corresponding resources are offered to all teachers in the district

Teaching to Expectations (Units of Study)

Curriculum documents are designed to teach the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs) to all students. The units of study are divided into three stages based on the genres to be explicitly taught at each grade level. **Stage 1** of each unit identifies the desired results for all students in a specific grade level. Stage 1 specifies what each student should know, understand, and be able to do at the end of the unit. The “desired results” designates the content worthy of understanding, what enduring understandings are desired, and what essential questions will be explored. Stage 1 calls for clarity about the priorities of the unit. **Stage 2** of each unit determines the acceptable evidence from the desired understandings and content of the unit of study. Stage 2 provides diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment to allow educators to know when students have achieved the desired results of the unit. This stage describes the acceptable evidence of a student’s understanding and proficiency. The assessment evidence reflects the desired results of Stage 1. **Stage 3** of each unit is the instructional plan. Stage 3 suggests the activities, sequence, and resources which are best suited to accomplish the goals established in Stage 1. This stage focuses on the knowledge and skills students need to perform effectively to achieve the desired results. The goal is to make teaching engaging and effective for learners, while always keeping the end in mind.

English Language Arts

The kindergarten through third grade curriculum writing teams drafted reading guides winter 2009. All elementary teachers received draft guides and professional development fall 2009 and 2010. Full implementation of guides in classrooms is scheduled fall 2010.

In the area of writing at the elementary level, teams will assemble during the 2009-2010 school year to review resources. The outcome of the review will drive development of K-5 writing curriculum guides during 2010-2011 with full implementation and professional development in 2011-2012. Serving as living documents, writing teams will review guides yearly to a) incorporate diagnostic assessments, b) adjust expectations for learning experiences based on data, c) include scaffolding and reference materials, and d) strengthen units of study. At the secondary level, teams assembled fall 2009 to review resources and write guides for targeted courses. English curriculum guides drafted in 2007-2008 were scheduled for full implementation during 2009-2010 or 2010-2011. Professional development activities occurred fall 2009 and will in fall 2010. Plans to conduct resources audits for specific elective English courses will occur during 2011-2012 with possible adoption recommendations and curriculum development work in 2012-2013.

Math

A representative group of elementary teachers assembled in fall 2008 to explore options for new resources aligned with state expectations and based on best practices for grades K-5. Following the scheduled resource pilot in January 2009, mathematics leadership team members will identify and recommended a new series in March 2009. Professional development activities were scheduled for late summer and fall 2009 that provided assistance to classroom teachers with using guides and new textbook series to teach grade-level content expectations. During 2008-2010, the curriculum writing team, along with classroom teachers, convened periodically to report on the quality of guides and offered recommendations for improvement. The implementation began in fall 2009 and will be provided with ongoing opportunities for improving guide components and professional development.

With respect to middle school mathematics, the leadership team will review resources during 2009-2010 to investigate quality, relevance in meeting state expectations, and unification of format and content with the K-5 program. Based on findings, the adoption and curriculum development process may occur in 2010-2011 with scheduled professional development in fall 2011. In the meantime, to focus instruction on grade-level content expectations and support instructional practices, mathematics writing teams will assemble in winter 2009 to strengthen currently used guides. In winter 2009, high school curriculum writing teams collaborated with teachers to complete guides drafted during 2007-2008. In fall 2009, teachers received drafts guides and are expected to fully implement the program during 2009-2010. Plans to conduct resource audits for specific elective courses will occur 2010-2011. Revisions in state course expectations will direct future curriculum writing efforts during 2010-2011 and 2011-2012

Science

During the 2007-2008, the district adopted a K-6 science program developed by Battle Creek Area Mathematics and Science Center (BCAMSC) in Battle Creek, Michigan. BCAMSC curriculum guides contain instructional units aligned with grade level content expectations for life, earth, and physical science strands. On a yearly basis, BCAMSC provides teachers with updated unit activities and curriculum guides (components), includes resources to address realignment needs indicated by MDE, and offers professional development. Over the past two years, the district has phased in units by specific grade levels. In accordance with the final phase of implementation plan, 3rd through 6th grade teacher received the newly realigned science units with curriculum guides and training in fall 2009. consistent with the elementary direction and based on the results of an resource audit conducted in 2007, the science leadership teams will consider piloting BCAMSC units along with other resource options for 7th and 8th grades in spring 2010. Upon approval, the leadership team will deliver professional development sessions during 2010-2011. In the meantime, the 7th grade curriculum writing team assembled in winter 2009 to draft pacing guides and identify supplementary materials for use in fall 2009. Similarly, the 8th grade curriculum writing team assembled in winter 2009 to continue writing pacing guides previously drafted in 2007-2008. Seventh and eighth grade teachers received draft pacing guides in fall 2009 with supporting professional development. Full implementation of the 7th and 8th grade science curriculum guides will occur 2010-2011.

In 2010-2011, curriculum writing teams will implement secondary science guides drafted during 2008-2009. Curriculum teams worked during the summer in writing these guides to provide teachers with drafts and professional development in the fall 2009. Teachers will fully implement revised guides in 2011 with opportunities for improving guide components and professional development. Curriculum writing teams will assemble during 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 to investigate alignment between high school content expectations and currently used textbooks in honors and elective courses. Based on findings, recommendations for adoptions and the subsequent revision of curriculum guides will occur in winter 2010 with professional development during 2010-2011.

Social Studies

To address MDE revisions at the elementary level curriculum writing teams conducted K-5 resource audits to ensure alignment to the grade level content expectations. Teachers will receive draft guides in fall 2010 with supporting professional development. Full implementation of guides is expected fall 2011. At the middle school level, 6th grade recently underwent a textbook adoption and as a result, curriculum writing teams assembled draft curriculum guides that provide direction in implementing the newly adopted series in the fall of 2009. Teachers engaged in professional development in fall 2009 and will continue the work during the year. Full implementation of the revised guide is scheduled fall 2010.

During 2009-10, the middle school social studies curriculum writing team will review grade level content expectations and resources to determine cohesiveness of the 6th and 7th grade courses. Recommendations to shift or redistribute partial content in 7th grade to 6th may occur based on breadth of current MDE social studies topics. This decision will assist with ensuring vertical articulation between courses. Based on resource needs, the curriculum writing team may recommend an adoption during 2009-2010. The 7th grade curriculum writing team will continue drafting curriculum pacing guides during 2009-2010 with full implementation in 2011. In 8th grade, a textbook adoption committee convened in 2007-2008 to conduct a resource audit and pilot selected resources. As a result of the pilot, committee members recommended a new textbook series for adoption in winter 2010. In the meantime, the curriculum writing team will complete 8th grade previously drafted in 2008-2009. Teachers received draft guides in fall 2009 with scheduled professional development. Full implementation of the 8th grade guides with new resources is scheduled 2011.

High school social studies curriculum guides drafted in 2007-2008 are scheduled for full implementation in 2010-2011. To meet timelines, curriculum teams have assembled this year to continue writing guides. Several of these guides will undergo major revisions due to new MDE high school content expectations. Teachers received draft guides in fall 2009 along with professional development. With respect to elective courses, curriculum writing teams will conduct resource audits during 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Curriculum writing teams may offer recommendations for adoptions based on findings. Writing teams will complete related work with developing curriculum guides between 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

Variations

All schools use Kalamazoo Public School's curriculum guides that are aligned to MDE expectations and standards. Magnet schools and schools with special themes integrate their specialized areas into the KPS curriculum.